

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 24 2007

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated March 14, 2007. Claims 1-8 remain pending in this application. Claims 1 and 7 were finally rejected by the Examiner. Claims 2-6 and 8 have been objected to by the Examiner for being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 1 has been cancelled. Claims 2 and 3 are the independent claims. Applicant has amended Claims 2-4 and 7-8. Applicant has added new Claim 9. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the merits, the Office Action objected to the claims because of the listed informalities. Furthermore, the Office Action rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action also rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izumi (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,501; hereinafter "Izumi") in view of Kadijk et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0039734; hereinafter "Kadijk"). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections for at least the following reasons.

In addition, Claims 2-6 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Further, Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner pointing out allowable subject matter.

Applicant has amended Claim 4 in response to the Examiner's objections regarding informalities. The Examiner further suggested amendment to Claims 3 and 6 for informalities but

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 24 2007

such suggested amendments cannot be made because the language the Examiner is suggesting was already put forth in Claims 3 and 6 by the Applicant in the Response to Office Action filed December 14, 2006. Furthermore, Applicant has amended Claim 7 and now believes this claim to be allowable over the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection.

Applicant has cancelled Claim 1. Applicant believes Claims 2 and 3 to be allowable over the prior art. Furthermore, Claims 4-7 and 9 depend from independent Claim 3 and Claim 8 depends from independent Claim 2 and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims over the references cited, and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Adam L. Stroud,  
Reg. No. 48,410  
Attorney  
(408) 904-3618  
April 24, 2007